

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Figures 10 and 11 have been amended to include the designation
--PRIOR ART-- in the attached Submission of Formal Drawings. Approval of the
drawings is respectfully requested.

REMARKS

Claims 27-77 are pending in the application. Claims 27-66 have been withdrawn as being directed to nonelected subject matter. Claims 67-77 are currently under examination. By this Amendment, the specification and claim 68 are amended. No new matter is added.

Drawings

The Office Action objects to the drawings. In particular, the Office Action asserts that Figures 10 and 11 should be designated by a legend such as --PRIOR ART--. Applicants have submitted herewith new formal drawings for Figures 10 and 11 designating these Figures as --PRIOR ART--. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is thus respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to claim 68 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form. In particular, the Office Action asserts that claim 68 fails to limit the subject matter of claim 68 as both claims require "having a boron-less filter and boron absorbing filter." Applicants believe that this rejection is overcome with the above amendment to claim 68. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection under 37 CFR 1.75(c) to claim 68 are respectfully requested.

Section 102 and 103 Rejections

The Office Action rejects claims 67-69 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kobayashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,997,598). The Office Action somewhat similarly rejects claim 70 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Kobayashi et al. in view of "Applicant Admitted Prior Art" (referred to hereinafter "AAPA"). Claims 71-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Kobayashi et al. in view of Mitani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,804,494) in view of AAPA. These rejections are traversed.

The present claims require, inter alia, "[c]lean room air conditioning facilities comprising an air conditioner having a boron-less filter and a boron adsorbing filter; and one or more wafer treatment apparatuses **each having a boron-less filter**" (see claim 67). The atmosphere gas is recycled between the air conditioner, the clean room and the wafer treatment apparatuses.

Kobayashi et al. describe an air filter for a clean room. In their Example 3, Kobayashi et al. disclose that "the wall material, the filter material for the air filter (ULPA filter) and the sealing material for securing the filter medium and the frame of the air filter were used in the combination shown in Table 6 to fabricate each of local facilities for use in semiconductor production apparatus" (column 14, lines 55-60).

The Office Action asserts that Kobayashi et al. teaches "...one or more of wafer treatment apparatuses (local facilities) each having a boron-less filter (ULPA filter)..." (see section #4 on page 3 of the Office Action).

However, Applicants respectfully note that Table 6 on columns 23 and 24 of the Kobayashi et al. patent makes clear that the boron content of the ULPA filter ("U.F.") material ranges from 15 to 52 $\mu\text{g/g}$.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Kobayashi et al. does not teach or suggest the inclusion of a "boron-less" filter for each wafer treatment apparatus. Applicants therefore further submit that the present claims, which require such a "boron-less" filter can be anticipated by nor would have been obvious over Kobayashi et al.

Additionally, as Kobayashi et al. only teaches utilizing "boron-containing" filters for the asserted wafer treatment apparatus, Applicants respectfully submit that Kobayashi et al. thus teach against utilizing a "boron-less" filter for the asserted wafer treatment apparatus.

The asserted AAPA is applied to show that boron can attach on a surface of a silicon wafer. However, as the AAPA does not teach or suggest "one or more wafer treatment apparatuses each having a boron-less filter" as required by the present claims, the AAPA fails to make up for the deficiencies in Kobayashi et al.

Mitani et al. is applied only to show the boron concentration in a silicon wafer. As is the case for AAPA, Mitani et al. does not teach or suggest "one or more wafer treatment apparatuses each having a boron-less filter" as required by the present claims. Mitani et al. thus fails to make up for the deficiencies in Kobayashi et al. and in the AAPA.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that present claims 67-77, all of which require "one or more wafer treatment apparatuses each having a

boron-less filter," are patentable over Kobayashi et al. alone, or in any combination with the AAPA and/or Mitani et al.

For at least the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 67-69 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), of claim 70 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and of claims 71-77 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below to schedule a personal or telephone interview to discuss any remaining issues.

If this response is not considered timely filed, Applicants petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, making reference to Attorney Docket No. 107242-00017.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert K. Carpenter
Registration No. 34,794

Customer 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810